



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"Ob aber, wie die herausgeberin anzunehmen geneigt erscheint, alle die stücke von einer hand herrühren, muss doch mehr als zweifelhaft erscheinen"; and again, "In betreff der sprache hätten wir die ausführungen der herausgeberin gerne etwas vertiefter gesehen." Both reviewers, however, give its due meed of praise to the work. Since the editions of the Towneley, Coventry, and Chester Plays are now almost inaccessible, this edition cannot fail to introduce the *Mysteries* to a much wider public, and to the student of language it will prove of untold value.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

A Study of the Anglo-Saxon Poem, *The Harrowing of Hell* (Grein's *Höllenfahrt Christi*). By JAMES HAMPTON KIRKLAND. Halle, 1885.

This pamphlet of 54 pages is a Leipzig doctor-dissertation, the contents of which embrace the following sections: Introduction, Summary of Opinion, Sources of the Poem, Cynewulf's Treatment of His Sources, Style of the Poem, Vocabulary and Grammatical Examination, Epithets and Phrases, and Versification. It is, therefore, an attempt to ascertain whether Cynewulf was the author of the poem. From his examination of the sources, the writer concludes that this poem is "no translation of the Gospel of Nicodemus, nor is it based upon it in the same sense in which *Elene* and *Juliana* are based upon their respective sources," but that "the author probably knew and had read the Gospel of Nicodemus." An examination of the way in which Cynewulf treats his sources in the *Christ* and the *Riddles* leads to the conclusion "that the relation of the *Riddles* and *Christ* to their respective sources cannot be indicated by canons made for *Elene* and *Juliana*, and that they show not so much a following of any one authority as wide reading and the use of many authors, which seems to be the way in which [this poem] has been built up from its sources." A further examination of the vocabulary and grammar, after the manner of the articles in *Anglia* of recent years by Charitius, Fritzsche, Gaebler, and Lefèvre, treating other disputed poems of Cynewulf, leads to the result that "the vocabulary is quite in accord with that of Cynewulf," though from the forms "nothing of very positive weight is gained for the question of authorship." On the whole, the writer evidently inclines to the view that Cynewulf may have written the poem without stating positively that he did write it, but the dissertation closes very abruptly, after a notice of the versification, and without a summing up of the argument, which we should have expected. Wülker has evidently given a great impulse to the study of Anglo-Saxon, especially by American students, but this statistical method of determining the authorship of works, now so much in vogue among the Germans, is apt to have more laid upon it than it will bear.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Ueber die Homerrecension des Zenodot, von ADOLF RÖMER. Pp. 84. München, 1885.

The school of St. Petersburg, with Nauck at its head, has long been regarded as the School for Scandal in its vilifications of the reputation of the Alexandrian critics. The exchange of hostilities between the four centres of Homeric criticism—Leyden, Munich, Königsberg and St. Petersburg—is

certainly the admirable converse of the opinion of Dr. Johnson that the mutual exchange of compliments between contemporary authors is one of the most laughable features of the age. The good old godfather of Alexandrian 'Ομηρικοί, the critic who has the undying honor of having first recognized the existence of errors in the Homeric text, is branded by Nauck as the well-meaning but stupid *librarius* who unconsciously preserved the readings of tradition. It could hardly be expected that this assertion could pass unchallenged by the "quadrilateral"; and the South-German Aristarchean, Römer, has now rushed to the breach to repel the St. Petersburg scholar, and to assert that, so far from being a stupid conservator of tradition, Zenodotus represents the most diseased and the boldest hypercriticism that antiquity ever practised upon the divine bard, a critic who is characterized by *Kühnheit, Gewaltsamkeit und der crasseste Subjectivismus*. No one has failed to observe that no small portion of the Teutonic fondness for *Kraftausdrücke* appears in Ludwig; and Cobet's most Ciceronian periods and Römer's most rhetorical passages deal with matters pertaining to Homeric investigation :

ἐνθα κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὀνόσαιτο μετελθών,
ὅς τις ἔτ' ἀβλητος καὶ ἀνοῦτατος ὀξέει χαλκῷ
δινέουσι κατὰ μέσσον —.

Zenodotus is the representative of a critical system in the Sturm und Drang period of Homeric study, and hence it is folly either to praise or condemn him on the strength of each reading *per se*, as has been done by a generation of scholars. We need to penetrate into the *motifs* which animated his departure from a supposed vulgate and thus to form some adequate conception of his methods in their entirety and of their results. Such an investigation we do not possess, and Römer's treatise is not destined to fill this long-felt want. But as offering much assistance in this extremely difficult department of research it is not without its value.

We owe our knowledge of Zenodotean readings to Aristonicus rather than to Didymus. Römer's results as to the interrelation of these two authorities may be of interest. (1) Using the *ὑπομνήματα* of Aristarchus as his foundation, Aristonicus criticises Z. in a rigorous and oftentimes unjust manner (*γελῶνως, εὐήθως*, etc.). (2) Aristarchus had complete and exact information in reference to the readings, *ἀθετήσεις*, and interpolations of his predecessor. (This information, R. claims, Aristarchus had by autopsy. I cannot regard his proof of this assertion as perfectly satisfactory. See Ludwig, *Arist. Homerische Textkritik*, I p. 6). When Aristonicus regards as his chief authority the *ὑπομνήματα* of A. treating of Z.'s edition, and makes no use of subsidiary sources, his authority is greater than that of others who do not base their assertions upon this foundation alone, but have recourse to less trustworthy sources. Römer goes beyond the statements of former scholars in his assumption that even if Aristarchus had knowledge of the actual readings, etc., of Z., he was almost completely ignorant of the reasons which determined the changes, rejections and interpolations of his predecessors. To compensate for his ignorance on this point, he was compelled to have recourse to speculation. Hence he was guilty of numerous errors in his endeavor to grasp the full significance of the critical activity of Zenodotus. Unfortunately Zenodotus left nothing except his edition and works on glosses that could serve Aristarchus

as a guide in his endeavor to estimate the value of this critical activity (cf. H 127, Υ 114).

Didymus is sufficiently free from the belief that takes authority for truth to recognize the merits of Z., whose readings he, however, cites with no little caution (cf. A 97). I do not think much stress can be laid upon R  mer's assertion that Didymus appears to have had more immediate sources of information than Aristonicus, on the ground that he cites opinions or remarks as emanating from Zenod. himself (H 667). It is R  mer's opinion that we know practically nothing of the *apparatus criticus* of Z. and of the age of his MSS. The citation of Homeric passages in writers before Z. is but poor authority for the determination of mooted passages and of the readings of Z.; otherwise Ajax 830 *ῥιφθῶ κυσὶν πρόβλητος οἰωνοῖς θ'* ἔλωρ might weigh in the balance against the vulgate, and against Zenodotus' reading in the notorious verse A 5. R  mer has as poor an opinion of the *Μασσαλιωτική*, *Χία*, etc., as Aristarchus apparently had. It is more probable that real or nominal philologists assisted in the fabrication of these MSS, than that they represent a genuine originality consecrated by tradition. Z. probably possessed a copy of the *Μασσ.* (T 76), and perhaps the *Χία* (P 134) and the *Ἀργολικῇ* (Σ 39). He has not followed these editions blindly, though they appear to have induced him to athetize verses; hence his criticism was not dictated solely by subjective considerations. In regard to the interpolations of Z., we must distinguish between those which were caused by his less authoritative sources and those which were based on his views of Hom. *ἐρμηνεία* (Ξ 136). In all the attacks made upon Z. there is not a hint that he had not the support of authoritative MSS. Aristarchus, unable to judge of the *motif* of Z.'s readings, formed his opinion of the text and held to it against any opponent. Hence it is possible to show that in certain cases Z.'s readings are better than those of A. (*circa* 12), though by this it is not denied that Z. frequently deserted MS tradition.

Z. was not restrained from making a second conjectural emendation when it was necessitated by a first (cf. H 666 and the omission of 677). Though many of his readings are similar to those of the common text, according to the *ductus litterarum* (γ 217, A 34, B 299, N 71), he does not seem to have made use of this method of emendation, so usual among the moderns. A constant source of error, first removed by Aristarchus, was the adoption of MS readings which had forced their way in through an assumed Homeric *συνήθεια* (K 10, B 56, N 627, ὠδε, κείθι, etc.). The result of this tendency was the introduction of prosaic and usual forms of expression in preference to those more poetical and rare, A 841. I cannot but demur to R  mer's assumption (p. 52) that for the old *ἐπὶ* the younger *ἐοῖο* was substituted. The following are other points of view: 1. For *ἅπασι* *λέγ.* more usual words are constantly substituted (Υ 11), and in fact to such a degree that Z. has freed himself from the limitations imposed by MS authority (A 439, Z 285). 2. A fondness for literal explanation and interpretation without having recourse to ellipsis or metaphor (Θ 139, K 98). 3. The poet must say *everything*, and hence an assumption of *κατὰ τὸ σιωπῶμενον* is illegitimate (Φ 335, P 456). It was in this category that Z. committed most of his deadly sins. 4. The desire for emphasis and strength, *ἐμφαντικῶς* *τερον* (A 34, O 44, A 492). 5. The desire to avoid tautological expressions (E 194, H 127). 6. Predilection in favor of change of expression (Ξ 177).

7. Unconditional uniformity of epic style and the agreement of the poet with himself are often insisted on (E 809, I 660, β 81, Σ 154-5, which Römer places also under 6). A remarkable exception is Γ 334. 8. Objection to the ἀπρεπῆ was the cause of many changes, but of more ἀθετήσεις (Π 710, Λ 123, 138, O 342). An interesting example of this tendency is the desire to shelter the heroes from βλασφημία (γ 228). Zen. may have carried into practice as a critic what the philosopher enjoined in the *Politeia*. 9. Perhaps a desire to ascribe πολυμαθία to Homer in the matter of mythology (Π 175, 223, Φ 194, Ξ 259, δ 366).

In the earlier books, with the exception of Γ 18, we hear from Aristonicus almost entirely of ἀθετήσεις of Z. which are based on errors of the worst character. With H 195-199 a sudden change takes place in the scholia, and only those ἀθ. of Z. and Aristophanes are mentioned which received the approbation of Aristarchus. Perhaps in the first six books the epitomists failed to add to the ἀθ. of Aristarchus the important clauses ἡθέτηντο καὶ παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει καὶ Ζηνοδότῳ, ὁ δὲ Z. οὐδὲ ἐγράφευ, etc. Or perhaps Aristonicus' "ἀθετεῖται" refers to the whole triumvirate, a dangerous suggestion of Römer, which we would be glad to have demonstrated. The suggestion should not be overlooked that Z. with H may have come into the possession of a better critical apparatus.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.